



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,548	08/27/2003	Cristian E. Anghel	H0004290	5536
128	7590	08/11/2005	EXAMINER CUEVAS, PEDRO J	
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC. 101 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 2245 MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245			ART UNIT 2834	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/649,548

Applicant(s)

ANGHEL ET AL.

Examiner

Pedro J. Cuevas

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on June 22, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. In response to applicant's argument that "the starter/generator system of claim 1 utilizes a multi-use controller that operates as an exciter power supply during a start mode of operation and as a generator control unit during a generate mode of operation", a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).
3. Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. There is no clear reference to any structural characteristic on the claimed "multi-use controller" that will make it perform its intended use by a different process, or in a more efficient manner.
4. Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

Art Unit: 2834

5. It should be emphasized that “apparatus claims must be structurally distinguishable from the prior art.” MPEP 2114. *In re Danly*, 263 F. 2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959) it was held that apparatus claims must be distinguished from prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In *Hewlett-Packard Co. v Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990), the court held that: “Apparatus claims cover what a device is, not what it does” (emphases in original). To emphasize the point further, the court added: “An invention need not operate differently than the prior art to be patentable, but need only be different” (emphases in original).

6. It must also be noted that having one “multi-use controller” performing the same functions that two separate electronic circuits can, and do perform, involves only putting together or integrating such circuits, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article, which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together, involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893). The term “integral” is sufficiently broad to embrace constructions united by such means as fastening and welding. *In re Hotte*, 177 USPQ 326, 328 (CCPA 1973).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,594,322 A to Rozman et al. (prior art document submitted by applicant).

Rozman et al. clearly teaches the construction of a starter/generator system with variable-frequency exciter control comprising:

- a synchronous and brushless starter/generator (10) including an exciter generator (14) with a DC winding;

- a start converter (36) for starting an engine in combination with said starter/generator; and

- a multi-use controller (84), for providing AC power to said exciter generator during a start mode of operation and DC power to said exciter generator during a generate mode of operation, comprising:

- a logic circuit (Figure 7B) for receiving input signals and generating output signals based on said input signals, which include:

- signals relating to a regulated voltage level being applied to a particular line portion of said starter/generator system,

- signals relating to the current level being applied to a predetermined portion of an AC bus, and

- signals selectively enabling the start mode or generate mode of operation;

- a switching circuit (72) for providing AC power to an exciter stator of a starter/generator system during a start mode of operation and DC power to said exciter stator during a generate mode of operation based on said output signals, and includes a full bridge arrangement (Figure 7A) of electronic switches

Art Unit: 2834

including at least four switches for providing said AC and DC power to said exciter stator;

wherein said controller provides:

the AC power during said start mode with a predetermined magnitude and frequency to energize an exciter stator in said starter/generator, and

the DC power during said generate mode with a predetermined voltage level to produce a regulated voltage level output from said starter/generator, which is applied at a predetermined portion of an AC bus.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2834

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pedro J. Cuevas whose telephone number is (571) 272-2021. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg can be reached on (571) 272-2044. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Pedro J. Cuevas
July 29, 2005



DARREN SCHUBERG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800